

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

CARRIE MARIE HALL,
Plaintiff,

v.

ANTHONY DANIELS, *et al*,
Defendants.

Case No. C07-5624FDB-KLS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT
OF COUNSEL

This matter has been referred to Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Local Magistrates Rules MJR 3 and 4, and Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The case is before the Court upon plaintiff's filing of a motion for appointment of counsel. (Dkt. #5). Plaintiff has been granted *in forma pauperis* status in this case. After reviewing the motion and the balance of the record, the Court finds and ORDERS as follows:

There is no right to have counsel appointed in cases brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. While the court, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), can request counsel to represent a party proceeding *in forma pauperis*, it may do so only in exceptional circumstances. Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984); Aldabe v. Aldabe, 616 F.2d 1089 (9th Cir. 1980). A finding of exceptional circumstances requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of plaintiff to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the

1 complexity of the legal issues involved. Wilborn, 789 F.2d at 1331.

2 Here, plaintiff has not shown a likelihood of success on the merits or that the legal issues involved
3 in this case are necessarily complex. Indeed, she has presented no specific reasons as to why she believes
4 counsel should be appointed at government expense in her case. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for
5 appointment of counsel (Dkt. #5) hereby is DENIED.

6 The clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to plaintiff.

7 DATED this 11th day of February, 2008.

8
9
10 

11 Karen L. Strombom
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28